



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,976	05/16/2005	Soichiro Watanabe	272239US0PCT	1724
22850	7590	09/28/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MERCIER, MELISSA S	
			ART UNIT 1615	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/534,976	Applicant(s) WATANABE, SOICHIRO	
	Examiner Melissa S. Mercier	Art Unit 1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

Receipt of Applicants Remarks and Amended Claims filed on July 27, 2007 is acknowledged. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 6-7, and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344) in view of Leverett (US Patent 6,132,739).

Shiraishi discloses a temporary hair dye containing titanium black and other pigments (abstract). Titanium-titanium dioxide sintered substance is disclosed as titanium black (column 2, lines 9-10). The titanium black is present in the amount of 0.5 to 5 parts by weight in examples 4-5 and comparative examples 1 and 5. Water is disclosed as the principle solvent (column 3, lines 36-38). Additionally, resins, surfactants, perfumes, oil & fats, scarcely volatile hydrocarbons, silicone oils, and water can be added (column 4, lines 10-12).

Shiraishi does not disclose the use of polyvinyl alcohol, anionic surfactants, or water-soluble thickeners.

Leverett discloses, a "makeup compositions having enhanced transfer resistance including at least one hydrophilic film former. The makeup can be a water-in-oil emulsion having the hydrophilic film former in the internal water phase and at least one pigment in the external oil phase. The makeup composition can also be a suspension of one or more pigments in water in which the hydrophilic film former is dissolved. The hydrophilic film former may also be an anionic gelling agent, whereby the cationically-coated pigment and the anionic gelling agent form a water-dispersible complex that upon application to the skin forms an insoluble pigmented salt having enhanced transfer resistance"(abstract).

Leverett further teaches, "the water phase comprises a hydrophilic film former, polyvinyl alcohol" (column 4, lines 44-48). Effective amounts of the hydrophilic film former are from 0.1 to about 8%. (column 5, lines 10-16).

Regarding the specific conditions of preparation of the sinter, it is the examiners position that Shiraishi discloses the use of Tylack D, which applicant's specification on page 6, top paragraph, recites as an acceptable sinter.

The recitation of a peel-off cosmetic pack preparation in claim 15 is considered future intended use of the composition and therefore, not given patentable weight.

The instant claims differ from the references only in the specific percentage selected for the compositions. However, It would have been deemed prima Facie

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the particles size of the titanium-titanium dioxide sinter in order to obtain the desired color intensity, the ratio of titanium to titanium dioxide, and the mixture of polyvinyl alcohol, in order to obtain a cosmetic composition with the desired consistency and properties, because the determination of a specific percentage/ratios having the optimum therapeutic effect is well within the level of one having ordinary skill in the art, and the artisan would be motivated to determine optimum amounts to get the maximum effect of the active compounds. Therefore, the invention as Whole has been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the hydrophilic film former polyvinyl alcohol with the pigmented titanium-titanium dioxide sinter since it has a strong coloring power and Shiraishi discloses the use of a resin system, therefore, It is generally considered to be prime facie obvious to combine compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a composition that is to be used for an identical purpose. The motivation for combining them flows from their having been used individually in the prior art, and from them being recognized in the prior art as useful for the same purpose. As shown by the recited teachings, instant claims are no more than the combination of conventional components of film forming resins. It therefore follows that the instant claims define prime facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the present invention relates to a cosmetic pack preparation, which is entirely different from the hair dye or the makeup cosmetic composition. That is, the cosmetic pack preparation has the objective of cleansing the skin by a film, supplying moisture, promoting blood circulation, and percutaneously absorbing active components, whereas the makeup cosmetic composition has the objective of decorating the skin, nail, and the like. For example, a makeup cosmetic composition is applied to the face, nail, and the like in order to show them in a different color or to provide a three dimensional effect by shading the face. In addition, neither Shiraishi et al nor Leverett, alone or in combination, provides any disclosure suggesting the use of their compositions as a cosmetic pack preparation. Applicant additionally argues In contrast, since the W/O-type emulsion of Leverett has an internal water phase containing a hydrophilic film former such as polyvinyl alcohol as a dispersion phase which cannot be a continuous film, the emulsion cannot be used as peel-off type cosmetic pack composition which requires formation of a continuous film.

The examiner notes that the claims are drawn a composition, not a method of treatment, utilizing the terminology comprising allowing for the inclusion of any number of components regardless of their effect on the composition. The future intended use/function of the composition does not hold patentable weight.

Claims 2-5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344) in view of Leverett (US Patent 6,132,739) and further in view of Cowsar et al. (US Patent 5,565,216).

The combined teachings of Shiraishi and Leverett are discussed above and applied in the same manner.

Shiraishi and Leverett do not disclose the use of an anionic surfactant, a water-swelling clay mineral or amorphous silicic anhydride and ascorbic acid derivative or a glycyrrhizic acid derivative.

Cowsar discloses a hair relaxer composition comprising a surfactant. Dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate is disclosed (column 8, lines 30-33). A thickener including hydrated magnesium aluminum silicate, anhydrous aluminum silicate and colloidal clay are disclosed (column 10, lines 38-45). Example 6 discloses the use of ascorbic acid.

It has been held that combinations of two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. In re Susi, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); In re Crockett, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21, 279 F.2d 274, 276-77, 126 USPQ 186, 188 (1960). As the court explained in Crockett, the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art. Therefore, since each of the references teach polymers, solvents, surfactants, antioxidants and free radical scavengers, are effective ingredients in cosmetic compositions, it would have been obvious to combine these plants with the

expectation that such a combination would be effective in cosmetic compositions. Thus, combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Cowsar et al disclose a hair relaxer which entirely differs from the hair dye of Shiraishi et al or the make-up cosmetic of Leverett. Cowsar et al thus does not provide a motivation to a person skilled in the art to combine with Shiraishi et al or Leverett. In addition, since the Shiraishi et al in view of Leverett and further in view of Cowsar et al do not disclose a cosmetic pack preparation at all, they do not anticipate the present invention which pertains to a cosmetic pack preparation. As discussed above, the instant claims are drawn to a composition, therefore, future intended use/function do not hold patentable weight. The components are known to be used in cosmetic formulations, therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize each component for its intended function to for another cosmetic formulation. .

Claim,9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344) in view of Leverett (US Patent 6,132,739) and further in view of Guerrero (US Patent 5,609,854).

The combined teachings of Shiraishi and Leverett are discussed above and applied in the same manner.

Shiraishi and Leverett do not disclose the use of a polyglycerol fatty acid ester.

Guerrero teaches a thickened and stabilized cosmetic emulsion composition.

Guerrero's composition comprises polyglycerol fatty acid esters as emollients.
(column 2, lines 62-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Leverett with the thickeners and stabilizers of Guerrero in order to achieve an aesthetically pleasing viscosity. Guerrero discloses "fluids that flow with a watery consistency too rapidly run off the treated skin areas. For cosmetics to be effective, it often must have substantively" (column 1, lines 12-20).

The applicants would have a reasonable expectation that the new composition would function as a cosmetic composition, since both references teach a cosmetic composition.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Guerro discloses a sunscreen agent, which is a different type of cosmetic from those disclosed in Shiraishi et al and Leverett. Guerro thus does not provide a motivation to a person skilled in the art to combine with Shiraishi et al and Leverett. In addition, since the Shiraishi et al, Leverett and Guerro do not disclose a cosmetic pack preparation at all, they do not anticipate the present invention, which pertains to a cosmetic pack preparation. As discussed above, the instant claims are drawn to a composition, therefore, future intended use/function do not hold patentable

weight. The components are known to be used in cosmetic formulations, therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize each component for its intended function to for another cosmetic formulation.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa S. Mercier whose telephone number is (571) 272-9039. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-4pm Mon through Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MSMercier



Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD
Primary Examiner
Group 1600